



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,220	07/22/2003	Ted Margison	067182-011	8360
7590	10/05/2005			EXAMINER
Attn: Craig A. Gelfound MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 34th Floor 2049 Century Park East Los Angeles, CA 90067			MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/625,220	MARGISON, TED	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Susanna M. Diaz	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-29,31 and 43-55 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-29,31 and 43-55 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final Office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment filed July 28, 2005.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 23, and 31 have been amended.

Claims 3, 30, and 32-42 have been cancelled.

Claims 43-55 have been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed July 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Guenther discloses a methodology for determining job requirements and desired training for each discreet job function in an organization... In contrast to Applicant's approach, the interview responses are not **compared to each other** to identify disconnects between members performing different job functions... Guenther does not disclose or suggest comparing selections made by one or more members to the selections made by other members. Rather, the interview results of Guenther are compared to a database established by consultants." (Page 10 of Applicant's response) As stated in the art rejection, Figs. 3, 5, 6; ¶¶ 72-89, 100 and Appendices A and B of Guenther teach that workers are asked to evaluate various aspects of their roles. Tables 1-5 display various answers that may be given by a worker regarding a process within the organization. Multiple workers may be given the

same survey questions (e.g., an audience segment may include a group of workers in a role category, as per ¶ 70). As admitted by Applicant, "the interview results of Guenther are compared to a database established by consultants." However, Guenther's consultants establish this database from responses gathered from other members whose roles are being evaluated ("The consultants then interview the subject matter experts, appropriate workers, or key contributors in an audience segment about roles 304 and core tasks 306... The consultants then edit and update the core task templates as a result of each interview, and store them in the database 211." See ¶ 72). Therefore, by comparing interview results from one member to the data stored in the database (i.e., responses gathered from other members), the collective interview responses of the members are compared to one another.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Since the scope of the comparing step recited in claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 is vague and indefinite (as discussed the § 112, 2nd paragraph rejection below), it is unclear whether or not these claims recite a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 are deemed to be non-statutory.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The scope of "comparing the selections made by one or more members" in line 1 is vague and indefinite. Does this limitation merely refer to recording input from the members made in the form of selections or is detailed analysis performed to evaluate such a comparison? If detailed analysis is performed, who or what (e.g., a computer) carries out the analysis and what is the extent of the analysis? If performed by a human, is there is an underlying methodology that yields consistent and reproducible results or is the invention completely dependent upon the subjective evaluation of humans, which varies depending on who is doing the evaluation, what mood he/she is in, etc.? If the analysis is purely subjective, then the concreteness and tangibility of the invention are questionable.

Applicant should cite pertinent excerpts from the specification to support the intended interpretation. A similar limitation is recited in claims 31 and 49; therefore, claims 31 and 49 are rejected under the same line of reasoning.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4-29, 31, and 43-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guenther et al. (US 2003/0139956) in view of Barney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,143).

Guenther discloses a process for profiling an organization having members comprising:

[Claim 1] presenting to members a survey, the results which are saved to a database that contains a plurality of processes of the organization and, for each process, a plurality of selectable characterizations of the process (Figs. 3, 5, 6; ¶¶ 72-89, 100; Appendices A and B -- Workers are asked to evaluate various aspects of their roles. Tables 1-5 display various answers that may be given by a worker regarding a process within the organization);

receiving selections from members through the survey of one or more of the characterizations of one or more of the processes (Figs. 3, 5, 6; ¶¶ 72-89, 100; Appendices A and B -- Workers are asked to evaluate various aspects of their roles. Tables 1-5 display various answers that may be given by a worker regarding a process within the organization. Multiple workers may be given the same survey questions (e.g., an audience segment may include a group of workers in a role category, as per ¶ 70));

comparing the selections made by one or more of the members to the selections made by other members to evaluate one or more of the processes (Figs. 3, 5, 6; ¶¶ 72-89, 100; Appendices A and B -- Workers are asked to evaluate various aspects of their roles. Tables 1-5 display various answers that may be given by a worker regarding a process within the organization. Multiple workers may be given the same survey questions (e.g., an audience segment may include a group of workers in a role category, as per ¶ 70)); and

generating a presentation based on the results of the evaluation (¶¶ 77-79; 87-89 -- Reports, i.e., presentations, summarizing results of the role analysis are generated);

[Claim 2] wherein the presentation includes an identification of an inconsistency in the characterizations of the same process by at least two members (¶¶ 79, 87-89, 109 -- Changes in a role(s) over time or gaps in skill, knowledge, or tasks, related to a role(s) may be identified by comparing stored role analysis profiles and recently gathered ones);

[Claim 4] wherein at least some of the processes are job functions in the organization (¶¶ 81, 83, Tables 1, 3);

[Claim 6] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function are systems that are used with the job function (¶¶ 82, 84, Tables 2, 4);

[Claim 7] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function are organizations that are involved with the job function (Appendix B shows various identified organizations involved with the job functions -- For example, "#4. Question 20" mentions resolving problems with "internal and external stake holders and vendors."

"#5. Question 21" mentions working with "team on the design of test cases." "#6.

Question 26" mentions coordinating with "Third Party requirements" and conducting negotiation with "stake holders." "#7. Question #31" mentions linking with "architects and customers");

[Claim 8] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function are products or services associated with the function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5);

[Claim 10] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function are one or more processes that precede the job function (¶ 82, Table 2 -- Prerequisites for a role);

[Claim 11] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function are inputs to or outputs from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 12] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include an identification of what is delivered in connection with an input to or output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by

developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 13] wherein what at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include a description of how an item is delivered in connection with an input to or an output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 14] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include an identification of what action the member takes in connection with an input to or an output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function.

For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 15] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include the importance of an input to or an output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed

middleware architectures are the delivered outputs. A worker's selection of one or more input(s) or output(s) as opposed to others implies the respective importance of the selected input(s) and/or output(s);

[Claim 16] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include an identification of what action the member takes in connection with an input to or an output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 18] wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include a trigger for an input to or output from the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs; Appendix B shows various implied workflows, i.e., tasks and training needed to begin or complete a given job);

[Claim 43] wherein the evaluation of one or more processes includes evaluating the interaction between members (Deciding how to assign various roles and responsibilities to a team (¶ 44) along with identifying inconsistencies among existing roles (¶ 79) implies that an interaction between members is assessed to decide how members will

interact, or in what capacity each will serve, as part of a team. Furthermore, ¶¶ 104-107 discuss how each member's core, support, and boundary work are assessed. Support work may enable the work of others; therefore, a member's support work may define an interaction between certain members);

[Claim 44] wherein the processes include job functions, and wherein at least some of the characterizations to the job functions include inputs to or outputs from the job functions (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 45] wherein the evaluation of the interaction between members includes evaluating the inputs to and outputs from the job functions (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 46] wherein the evaluation of the interaction between members includes comparing the output from a first one of the job functions to the input of a second one of the job function (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the

role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs);

[Claim 47] wherein the evaluation of one or more processes includes determining whether an inconsistency exists in the characterizations of the same process by at least two members (¶¶ 79, 87-89, 109 -- Changes in a role(s) over time or gaps in skill, knowledge, or tasks, related to a role(s) may be identified by comparing stored role analysis profiles and recently gathered ones);

[Claim 48] wherein the processes include job functions (¶¶ 81-85, Tables 1-5 -- Any skills or training (i.e., prerequisites) required to perform a role are inputs to a job function and the tasks associated with the role define the goal, or intended output, of each related job function. For example, by developing middleware architectures for customers (as per Table 1), it is understood that the developed middleware architectures are the delivered outputs).

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 4-29, Guenther's workers responds to a consultant's open-ended survey questions regarding a job analysis via an interview or focus group (¶¶ 73, 103). Guenther does not expressly teach that the workers complete such a survey via an electronic user interface nor that the survey interface itself provides a list of selectable answers from which each of multiple workers chooses a response to each question. However, Barney discloses a job analysis system/method that "allows a job analyst quickly to identify, review and manipulate pre-existing products construed from

past job analyses" and "allows accessibility across wide geographical spans and multiple types of computer platforms" and "ensure[s] ongoing data integrity" (col. 2, lines 41-50). Barney provides each user with an interface specifically relevant to each job title (Fig. 6). Various characterizations of job-related functions are displayed in drop-down lists of available selections, including those associated with required skills, training, tasks, work behaviors, etc. (Figs. 6, 8A-11B). Both Guenther and Barney focus on the analysis of various jobs (or roles) and related requirements and Barney presents an automated job analysis tool that is pertinent to Guenther's goal of gathering job/role analysis information from multiple workers familiar with common jobs and roles.

Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Guenther to incorporate Barney's job analysis user interface with selectable job analysis factors (including those specifically recited in claims 6-18) accessible via drop-down menus to allow Guenther's consultant (or job analyst) to more quickly identify, review, and manipulate pre-existing job analysis data while conducting surveys more conveniently with workers who may be geographically dispersed (as suggested by Barney). Furthermore, the Examiner submits that it is old and well-known in the art of surveying to require a group of survey participants to select from among a list of pre-defined responses in order to facilitate the more consistent use of terminology among the participants (as opposed to letting the participants express responses in their own words), thereby simplifying the interpretation of the participants' responses and analysis thereof. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of Applicant's invention to further modify the Guenther-Barney combination such that at least two members are provided with the same survey selections (i.e., the multiple survey respondents are given the same survey with the same available answers from which to select for each role) in order to facilitate the more consistent use of terminology among the participants (as opposed to letting the participants express responses in their own words), thereby simplifying the interpretation of the participants' responses and analysis thereof.

Claims 19-29 recite the details of the user interface presenting the survey to each member. As discussed above, Barney provides each user with an interface specifically relevant to each job title (Fig. 6). Various characterizations of job-related functions are displayed in drop-down lists of available selections, including those associated with required skills, training, tasks, work behaviors, etc. (Figs. 6, 8A-11B). In other words, Barney teaches the following features:

- [Claim 19] wherein the member is prompted to make a selection (Figs. 6, 8A-11B);
- [Claim 20] wherein the prompt includes a question (Figs. 6, 8A-11B);
- [Claim 21] wherein the user interface includes a first area for the member to make a selection in response to the prompt (Figs. 6, 8A-11B);
- [Claim 22] wherein the first area includes a drop-down box (Figs. 6, 8A-11B);
- [Claim 23] wherein the first area only allows the member to make a single selection (Fig. 8A -- The user can deal directly with one outdent at a time);

the user interface includes a second area for the member to make selections (Fig. 8B -- The user can drill down into an indent that allows the user to make multiple selections); and

wherein the second area allows the member to make multiple selections (Fig. 8B -- The user can drill down into an indent that allows the user to make multiple selections);

[Claim 24] wherein the user interface presents a series of prompts and includes an overview area that visually illustrates the location of the current prompt in the series of prompts (Figs. 8A-10 -- The highlighted box at the bottom of each screen indicates the location of the current prompt in the series of prompts. The user can either move through the indicated prompts in order or "Save and Exit" and move to a different section. The user can also move to different areas by clicking on the respective outdent/indent shown in Fig. 8A);

[Claim 25] wherein the member alters the sequence of prompts by selecting an item in the overview area other than the current prompt (Figs. 8A-10 -- The highlighted box at the bottom of each screen indicates the location of the current prompt in the series of prompts. The user can either move through the indicated prompts in order or "Save and Exit" and move to a different section. The user can also move to different areas by clicking on the respective outdent/indent shown in Fig. 8A);

[Claim 26] wherein the user interface is presented to different members on different computers (col. 3, lines 27-35);

[Claim 27] wherein at least some of the characterizations are arranged in a hierarchical format from general to specific and where members select characterizations by navigating through the hierarchical format from general to specific (Figs. 8A-10);

[Claim 28] wherein only a single characterization may be selected for a single process (Fig. 8A -- The user can deal directly with one outdent at a time);

[Claim 29] wherein a plurality of characterizations may be selected for a single process (Fig. 8B -- The user can drill down into an indent that allows the user to make multiple selections).

Again, both Guenther and Barney focus on the analysis of various jobs (or roles) and related requirements and Barney presents an automated job analysis tool that is pertinent to Guenther's goal of gathering job/role analysis information from multiple workers familiar with common jobs and roles. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Guenther to incorporate the specific user interface details and global access capabilities taught by Barney (and specifically pointed out in reference to claims 19-29 above) in order to allow Guenther's consultant (or job analyst) to more quickly identify, review, and manipulate pre-existing job analysis data while conducting surveys more conveniently with workers who may be geographically dispersed (as suggested by Barney).

Regarding claims 5, 9, and 17, neither Guenther nor Barney expressly teaches that each member (i.e., worker or survey participant) enters a date when he/she began

or ended a job function and storing the date received, a time frame for performing a job function and storing the time frame, or a time frame for receiving the input to or output from the job function. However, Guenther and Barney compare pre-existing job definitions to more recent, updated job analyses in order to glean the most accurate and current understanding of the functions associated with the job/role of interest (see ¶¶ 71, 77, and 86-89 of Guenther and col. 2, lines 41-44 and col. 6, lines 5-8 of Barney). Further, the Examiner submits that it is old and well-known in the art of job analysis that the requirements, functions, input, and outputs of different jobs/roles often evolve over time. This means that the value of the survey responses provided by each member is date-dependent. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to implement with the Guenther-Barney combination the steps of receiving from a member a date when the member began or ended a job function (claim 5); receiving from a member a time frame for performing a job function (claim 9); wherein at least some of the selectable characterizations of a job function include an identification of a time frame for receiving the input to or output from the job function (claim 17) in order to assist a job analyst in glean the value of each member's survey responses based on an understanding of the time period corresponding to each respective member's most recent experience(s) with a particular job/role. For example, the feedback from a member who has extensively worked in the IT industry within the past year is likely to be more accurate and up-to-date, and therefore more valuable, than feedback from a member whose opinions are based on experience in the IT industry that ended over ten years ago.

[Claim 31] Claim 31 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 1 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

[Claims 49-55] Claims 49-55 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1 and 43-48 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-6733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Susanna M. Diaz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623

October 1, 2005